



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,937	07/31/2003	Mark J. Levine	930009-2011	9678

20999 7590 01/03/2006

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG  
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER
----------

LONEY, DONALD J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/631,937

Applicant(s)

LEVINE ET AL.

Examiner

Donald Loney

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 22 and 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 17, 2005 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-13 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagura et al (5840378).

Nagura et al teaches a belt containing a fabric 2-6 containing a guide material 7, running in the machine direction, at the ends of the belt that fills in at least 85% of the fabric structure. Claims 3 and 4 have been excluded from this rejection since they recite encapsulating the fabric structure while claim 1 only refers to the fabric caliper (i.e. thickness). Element 8 can be considered the coating of claim 18. Refer to figure 12 along with column 2, lines 17-43, column 5, lines 41-59 and column 6, lines 38-48. This rejection is being made since no structure to the guide is included in the claims in or to distinguish from the prior art.

Art Unit: 1772

4. Claims 1-13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by either MacBean (3523867) or Fleischer (5422166).

Both references teach belt containing a fabric containing a guide material, running in the machine direction, at the ends of the belt that completely encapsulated the fabric. Refer to fabric 15, 17, 21 and guides 23 in figures 1, 3 and 4 in MacBean along with column 1, lines 29-63 and column 2, lines 5-20. Refer to fabric 10, 12, 14 and guides 16 or 18 in figures 1, 4 and 5 of Fleischer along with the Summary of the Invention and column 3, line 27 through column 4, line 57. Again, this rejection is being made since no structure to the guide is included in the claims in or to distinguish from the prior art.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1772

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 14, 15 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either MacBean or Fleischer et al in view of Tate et al (5558926).

The primary reference teaches the invention substantially as recited except for the guides being V shaped per claims 14 and 15, and the additional layer on the other side of the fabric per claims 18-21. See the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection above.

Tate discloses that guides 8 on fabric belts can be V shaped. Tate also discloses the additional layer 7 on the other side of the fabric belt. See figure 3.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to the primary references to form the guides V shaped. Motivated by the fact Tate et al discloses them as V shaped in order to run in corresponding grooves on a roller when used. The additional layer would also be obvious as taught by Tate et al to provide to the other side with a known coating.

9. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly et al (4008801).

Art Unit: 1772

Reilly et al discloses a fabric 18 containing guides 20 formed on both edges of a belt. The guides are V-shaped ribs 31 per claims 14 and 15. Another layer is located on the other side of the fabric per claims 18-21. Refer to figures 1, 2 and 2a. The guide is discloses as molded into the interstices of the fabric (column 3, lines 35-42) in order to securely and positively attach it thereto. The examiner deems the material flowing into the interstices as encapsulating the fabric caliper as recited by the applicant. Reilly et al is silent as to the depth of the encapsulation. The applicant recites at least 50% in claim 1.

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to Reilly et al to encapsulate at least 50% of the fabric motivated by the fact the prior art teaches it is known to encapsulate the fabric in order to securely and positively attach it thereto and the deeper into the fabric the material flows the greater that bond that would be since the material would be able to attach to more of the fabric.

10. Claims 22 and 23 are objected to as indicated previously.

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed September 23, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the V guide of Nagura et al could only encapsulate at most 15% of the fabric since layer 7 encapsulates at least 85% of the fabric. However, the examiner has relied upon layer 7 for the guides since the

Art Unit: 1772

claims rejected fail to define any structure to the guides that would distinguish from the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald Loney whose telephone number is (571) 272-1493. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Tues, Thurs and Fri. 8AM-4PM, flex schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Donald Loney  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1772

DJL:D.Loney  
12/26/05